

REMARKS

The indication that claims 2 - 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is acknowledged.

Applicants note that claim 2 depends from claim 1 whereas claims 3 - 5 are multiple dependent claims dependent upon claim 1 or claim 2. Thus, the Examiner has recognized that the features of claims 2 - 6 dependent upon only claim 1 would be allowable over the cited art.

By the present amendment, the features of objected to claim 3 have been incorporated into parent claim 1 such that claim 1, as amended, corresponds to objected to claim 3 written in independent form. It is noted, however, the recited features of claim 3 lack antecedent basis in claim 1, and therefore, for antecedent basis purposes, some features of claim 2 have also been incorporated into parent claim 1 so as to ensure proper antecedent basis for the recited features of claim 3 which have been incorporated into claim 1, and applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, should now be in condition for allowance since as noted by the Examiner, the cited art fails to show that "the second surface is higher than the rail surfaces of the rails" which was previously set forth in claim 3 and is now recited in independent claim 1, with claim 3 being canceled.

With respect to claims 2 and 4 - 6, as noted above, the Examiner has indicated that the claimed features thereof, as dependent upon claim 1, patentably distinguish over the cited art. By the present amendment, claim 2 has been retained in dependent form while being amended to provide for proper antecedent basis and should be in condition for allowance. With respect to dependent claims 4 - 6, it is noted that while such claims were previously in multiple dependent form dependent

upon claim 1 or claim 2, and indicated as being allowable when written in independent form, it is noted that for antecedent basis purposes, claims 4 - 6 have been amended to depend from claim 2, while being retained in dependent form, and should be considered allowable with independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2. Thus, applicants submit that claims 1, 2 and 4 - 6 should now be in condition for allowance.

With respect to claims 7 and 8, which stand withdrawn from consideration, applicants submit that claim 7 recites features indicated by the Examiner as patentably distinguishing over the cited art, and claim 7 has been amended to avoid possible problems with antecedent basis. More particularly, claim 7 corresponds to the features of objected claim 2 when considered with independent claim 1, prior to amendment. More particularly, the last paragraph of claim 7 recites the feature of "the second surface of the leading pad being higher than the third surface of the trailing pad", which the Examiner has recognized is not disclosed in the cited art, when pointing out the patentability of claim 2 over the cited art. Thus, applicants submit that claim 7 recites features considered allowable by the Examiner, and this claim should be considered at this time. Furthermore, since claim 7, should be considered allowable over the cited art, claim 8 which depends therefrom, and which recites further features which are not disclosed in the cited art should also be considered allowable at this time. Accordingly, applicants submit that withdrawn claims 7 and 8 should be considered at this time and should be considered allowable.

As to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Anaya-Dufresne et al (US 6,144,528), this rejection is considered to be obviated by


the incorporation of features of objected to claims into claim 1. Accordingly, discussion of the cited art is considered unnecessary at this time.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all claims present in this application should now be in condition for allowance, and an action of favorable nature is courteously solicited.

To the extent necessary, applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 500.42889X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Melvin Kraus', is written over a horizontal line.

Melvin Kraus
Registration No. 22,466

MK/jla
(703) 312-6600